



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/851,681	05/08/2001	John Baker	TTI-001	3254
8791	7590	05/31/2006	EXAMINER	
BLAKELY SOKOLOFF TAYLOR & ZAFMAN 12400 WILSHIRE BOULEVARD SEVENTH FLOOR LOS ANGELES, CA 90025-1030			MURPHY, RHONDA L	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2616	

DATE MAILED: 05/31/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/851,681	BAKER ET AL.
	Examiner Rhonda Murphy	Art Unit 2616

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 10 March 2006.
- 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-19,21-68 and 75 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-19,21-68 and 75 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on 29 August 2005 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1. This communication is responsive to the amendment filed on 3/10/06.

Accordingly, claims 20 and 69-74 have been canceled, claim 75 has been newly added and claims 1-19, 21-68 and 75 are currently pending in this application.

Claim Objections

1. Claim 37 is objected to because of the following informalities: Claim 37 is a duplicate of claim 35. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1 – 4, 23 – 25 and 34 – 38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lager et al. (US 6,636,502).

Regarding claim 1, Lager teaches a system comprising: a plurality of mobile stations (Fig. 8, **GRPS-MS**); at least one packet data network (Fig. 8, **PDN1** and **PDN2**); and a wireless access integrated node (WAIN) coupled to the plurality of mobile stations via a radio interface (represented by “**Sending NIP**” signal) and coupled to the at least one packet data network via a network interface (represented by P1 and P2 lines; col. 11,

lines 51-59) to provide an intermediating wired and/or wireless dedicated connection between the plurality of mobile stations and the at least one packet data network, wherein the dedicated connection is to implement a simplified protocol structure (Fig. 8, **PLMN-SW**; col. 11, lines 40-43; dedicated connections P1, P2).

Although Lager teaches a dedicated connection, Lager fails to explicitly disclose a dedicated broadband connection.

However, Examiner takes official notice that it is known in the art for wireless networks to consist of broadband connections.

In view of this, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to include a dedicated broadband connection, in order to provide a high speed, dedicated path for the subscribers to efficiently transmit data within the network.

Regarding claim 2, Lager further teaches a system wherein the packet data network is an Internet (the enclosed circle of Fig. 8).

Regarding claim 3, Lager further teaches a system wherein the packet data network is an intranet (Fig. 8, **PDN2**).

Regarding claim 4, Lager further teaches a system wherein a content server is attached to the intranet (Fig. 8, **Radius server**).

Regarding claim 23, Lager teaches a wireless data collector interconnected with the WAIN (Fig. 8, **GPRS-MS**; col. 15, lines 10-15).

Regarding claim 24, Lager teaches a system wherein the radio interface is a GPRS radio interface (GPRS-MS transmits over radio interface represented by "Sending NIP" signal in Fig. 8).

Art Unit: 2616

Regarding claim 25, Lager teaches a system wherein the network interface is an IP interface (Fig. 8, IP-TUN line connected to ISP2).

Regarding claim 34, Lager teaches a WAIN further supporting mobile stations roaming between a local WAIN environment and a public mobile network (Fig. 4, col. 5, lines 56-67).

Regarding claims 35 and 37, Lager teaches a WAIN further supporting mobile stations roaming between different WAIN systems (col. 5, lines 56-67).

Regarding claim 36, Lager teaches a WAIN further providing wireless data services in a community service area located within cells of a public network (Fig. 8, public networks ISP's) when the WAIN is clustered with other WAIN systems (Fig. 3, PLMN A and PLMN B).

Regarding claim 38, Lager teaches a WAIN further configuring the WAIN as a network node (Fig. 8, col. 11, lines 6-16).

3. Claims 21-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lager in view of Swartz (US 2003/0053444).

Regarding claim 21, Lager teaches a WAIN and commands from the mobile station to the appliance control system.

Lager fails to teach voice recognition capability for audibly replaying service request commands.

However, Swartz teaches voice recognition capability for audibly replaying service request commands (page 7, paragraph 72).

In view of this, having the system of Lager and then given the teachings of Swartz, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, to modify the system of Lager, by including voice recognition means, in order to allow the user to verbally request information from the appliance control system.

Regarding claim 22, Lager teaches a WAIN replaying an appliance status report delivered from the appliance control system to the mobile station.

Lager fails to teach text-to-speech capability to audibly replay the report.

However, Swartz teaches text-to-speech capability for audibly relaying information (page 7, paragraph 74).

In view of this, having the system of Lager and then given the teachings of Swartz, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, to modify the system of Lager, by including text-to-speech means, in order to allow the user to receive audio data which was originally in text form.

4. Claim 26 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lager in view of McNiff et al (US 2003/0076808).

Regarding claim 26, Lager teaches a system comprising a user to obtain a temporary subscription to the WAIN through a dynamic registration (col. 12, lines 66-67, col. 13, lines 1-12).

Lager fails to teach a temporary subscription and cancellation process in which the user's mobile station's secret subscription identity is linked with an equipment identity of the mobile station of the user.

However, McNiff teaches a temporary subscription and cancellation process (page 3, paragraph 36) in which the user's mobile station's secret subscription identity (page 3, paragraph 29) is linked with an equipment identity of the mobile station user (page 3, paragraph 28).

In view of this, having the system of Lager and then given the teachings of McNiff, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, to modify the system of Lager, by including a temporary subscription and cancellation process, in order to restrict access to registered users and maintain a secure network.

5. Claims 5-10, 12-14, 16, 27-33 and 75 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lager et al. (US 6,636,502) in view of Pines et al. (US 2003/0007625).

Regarding claim 75, Lager teaches the WAIN comprising: a plurality of mobile data transmission modules and signaling modules for sending, processing, and receiving data packets (Fig. 8, modules **SCM**, **SEL**, **MSC/VLR**, **NIP-RC** and transceiver (not shown) connected to the antenna of PLMN-SW, for communication with the GPRS-MS); a plurality of interfaces and ports for sending messages to and receiving messages from at least one packet data network, systems, and mobile stations interconnected with the

WAIN (col. 11, lines 17-24, 51-59); a database containing subscription and operating information for the plurality of mobile stations attached to the WAIN (Fig. 8, **HLR/SP**; col. 12, lines 66-67, col. 13, lines 1-3; col. 15, lines 32-36); and a main controller to coordinate and control the mobile data transmission modules, signaling modules, interfaces, and database (Fig. 8, **AC**; col. 12, lines 57-65).

Lager fails to teach a database containing charging information for the plurality of mobile stations attached to the WAIN.

However, Examiner takes official notice that it is known in the art for charging information is stored in a database for billing subscribers. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, to include a database containing charging data in order to record subscriber use/access to the network.

Lager also fails to teach a main controller for collecting charging data.

However, Pines teaches a main controller (Fig. 1, **service provider 26**) for collect charging data (page 16, paragraph 0200).

In view of this, having the system of Lager and then given the teachings of Pines, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, to modify the system of Lager, by collecting charging data within the main controller, in order to maintain subscriber records within a centralized location.

Regarding claim 5, Lager further teaches a system wherein the mobile data transmission module is a PDCP module (col. 8, lines 6-8).

Regarding claim 6, Lager further teaches a system wherein the mobile data transmission module is a RLC/MAC module (col. 5, lines 28-39; note col.10, lines 66-67, col. 11, lines 1-5).

Regarding claim 7, Lager further teaches a system wherein the mobile data transmission module is a Transceiver (TRX) module (Fig. 8, transceiver (not shown) connected to the antenna of PLMN-SW, for communication with the GPRS-MS).

Regarding claim 8, Lager further teaches a system wherein the signaling module is Radio Resource Management (module (not shown) located within SGSN of Fig. 8, col. 8, lines 6-30).

Regarding claim 9, Lager further teaches a system wherein the signaling module is GPRS Mobility Management (SCM of Fig. 8, col. 14, lines 64-67, col. 15, lines 1-10; wherein the SCM provides security by permitting or denying access to the packet data network).

Regarding claim 10, Lager further teaches a system wherein the signaling module is Session Management (NIP-RC of Fig. 8, col. 12, lines 49-54).

Regarding claim 12, Lager further teaches a local information system interface (Fig. 8, IP-TUN line).

Regarding claim 13, Lager further teaches an appliance control interface (Fig. 8, P1 line).

Regarding claim 14, Lager further teaches a system wherein the interface is an intranet gateway (an intranet gateway interface is inherent in the system depicted in Fig.

8, since an interface is required for the exchange of data between the access node of **PLMN-SW** and the intranet of **PDN2**).

Regarding claim 16, Lager teaches a local information system interconnected with the WAIN (Fig. 8, **ISP2**).

Regarding claim 27, Lager teaches mobile transmission modules including means for modulating data packets (it is well known in the art that data packets are modulated for transmission over a communication network).

Regarding claim 28, Lager teaches mobile transmission modules including means for compressing data packets (col. 3, lines 64-67, col. 4, lines 1-2).

Regarding claim 29, Lager teaches mobile transmission modules including means for encrypting data packets (col. 3, lines 41-45).

Regarding claim 30, Lager teaches mobile transmission modules including means for multiplexing data packets (multiplexing data packets are known in the art for transmitting signals over a single channel; TDMA is supported by GPRS, thus multiplexing is inherent).

Regarding claim 31, Lager teaches mobile transmission modules including means for correcting errors in data packets (error correction in data packets are well known in the art for proper data reception).

Regarding claim 32, Lager teaches mobile transmission modules including means for segmenting data packets (it is known in the art that data packets are segmented - encapsulated and decapsulated for transmission among different network protocols; col. 5, lines 32-39).

Regarding claim 33, Lager teaches mobile transmission modules including means for controlling the sequence of data packets (controlling the sequence of data packets is well known in the art, and occurs within the access control unit, **AC**, in Fig. 8).

6. Claims 11 and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lager et al. (US 6,636,502) and Pines et al. (US 2003/0007625) as applied to claim 75 above, and further in view of Gaffney (US 6,333,919).

Regarding claim 11, Lager teaches a system with interfaces.

Lager fails to explicitly teach a voice interface.

However, Gaffney teaches a system with voice interfaces (Fig. 1, **interface 110** and **120**).

In view of this, having the system of Lager and Pines and then given the teachings of Gaffney, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, to modify the system of Lager, by including a voice interface, in order to provide a link for the exchange of voice data between devices.

Regarding claim 15, Lager teaches a system having ports.

Lager fails to explicitly teach an RJ11 port for a fixed wired telephone connection.

However, Gaffney teaches a fixed wire telephone connection (Fig. 1, desk phone **450**; col. 4, lines 55-56) and it is known in the art that desk phones commonly use an RJ11 jack.

In view of this, having the system of Lager and Pines and then given the teachings of Gaffney, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art

at the time the invention was made, to modify the system of Lager, by including an RJ11 port, in order to provide a connection for telephone use.

7. Claim 17 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lager and Pines as applied to claim 16 above, and further in view of Doviak et al. (US 6,418,324).

Regarding claim 17, Lager teaches a WAIN with a local information system.

Lager fails to teach remotely synchronizing a personal digital assistant with its host program.

However, Doviak teaches remotely synchronizing a personal digital assistant (Fig. 1, **PDA 52**) with its host program (**MDC 54**; col. 9, lines 4-20).

In view of this, having the system of Lager and Pines and then given the teachings of Doviak, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, to modify the system of Lager, by remotely synchronizing a personal digital assistant with its host, in order to provide a user with a wider coverage area and more efficient service.

8. Claims 18-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lager and Pines as applied to claim 16 above, and further in view of Swartz (US 2003/0053444).

Regarding claim 18, Lager teaches a WAIN and commands from the mobile station to the local information system.

Lager fails to teach voice recognition capability for audibly replaying service request commands.

However, Swartz teaches voice recognition capability for audibly replaying service request commands (page 7, paragraph 72).

In view of this, having the system of Lager and then given the teachings of Swartz, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, to modify the system of Lager and Pines, by including voice recognition capability, in order to allow the user to verbally request information from the local information system.

Regarding claim 19, Lager teaches a WAIN replaying information from the local information system to the mobile station.

Lager fails to teach text-to-speech capability for audibly replaying information.

However, Swartz teaches text-to-speech capability for audibly replaying information (page 7, paragraph 74).

In view of this, having the system of Lager and Pines and then given the teachings of Swartz, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, to modify the system of Lager, by including text-to-speech capability, in order to allow the user to receive audio data which was originally in text form.

9. Claims 39 – 48, 50 – 52, 54, 57 – 68 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lager et al. (US 6,636,502) in view of Pines et al. (US 2003/0007625) and Benveniste (US 6,775,549).

Regarding claim 39, Lager teaches a device comprising: a plurality of mobile data transmission modules and signaling modules for sending, processing, and receiving data packets (Fig. 8, modules **SCM**, **SEL**, **MSC/VLR**, **NIP-RC** and transceiver (not shown) connected to the antenna of PLMN-SW, for communication with the GPRS-MS); a plurality of interfaces and ports for sending messages to and receiving messages from at least one packet data network, systems, and a plurality of mobile stations interconnected with said device (col. 11, lines 17-24, 51-59); a database containing subscription and operation information for the plurality of mobile stations attached to said device (Fig. 8, **HLR/SP**; col. 12, lines 66-67, col. 13, lines 1-3; col. 15, lines 32-36); and a main controller to coordinate and control said mobile data transmission modules, signaling modules, interfaces, port, and database (Fig. 8, **AC**; col. 12, lines 57-65); wherein the device directly intermediating between the plurality of mobile stations and at least one packet data network to provide a wired and/or wireless dedicated connection, wherein the dedicated connection is to implement a simplified protocol structure (Fig. 8, **PLMN-SW**; col. 11, lines 40-43; dedicated connections P1, P2),.

Although Lager teaches a dedicated connection, Lager fails to explicitly disclose a dedicated broadband connection.

However, Examiner takes official notice that it is known in the art for wireless networks to consist of broadband connections.

In view of this, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to include a dedicated broadband connection, in order to provide a high speed, dedicated path for the subscribers to efficiently transmit data within the network.

Lager fails to teach a database containing charging information for the plurality of mobile stations attached to the device.

However, Examiner takes official notice that it is known in the art for charging information to be stored in a database for billing subscribers. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, to include a database containing charging data in order to record subscriber use/access to the network.

Lager also fails to teach a main controller for collecting charging data.

However, Pines teaches a main controller (Fig. 1, **service provider 26**) for collect charging data (page 16, paragraph 0200).

In view of this, having the system of Lager and then given the teachings of Pines, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, to modify the system of Lager, by collecting charging data within the main controller, in order to maintain subscriber records within a centralized location.

Lager further discloses dynamic configuration of the device between the mobile stations and packet network (col. 16, lines 33-40). Lager fails to explicitly disclose the device automatically configuring itself to minimize interference between the plurality of mobile stations and the at least one packet network.

However, Benveniste discloses a base station automatically configuring itself to minimize interference between the plurality of mobile stations and the at least one packet network (col. 4, lines 39-49).

In view of this, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to modify Lager's system by automatically configuring itself to minimize interference, so as to enable mobile stations to communicate at the desired voice or data transmission quality without channel interference.

Regarding claim 40, Lager further teaches a system wherein the packet data network is an Internet (the enclosed circle of Fig. 8).

Regarding claim 41, Lager further teaches a system wherein the packet data network is an intranet (Fig. 8, **PDN2**).

Regarding claim 42, Lager further teaches a system wherein a content server is attached to the internet (Fig. 8, **Radius server**).

Regarding claim 43, Lager further teaches a system wherein the mobile data transmission module is a PDCP module (col. 8, lines 6-8).

Regarding claim 44, Lager further teaches a system wherein the mobile data transmission module is a RLC/MAC module (col. 5, lines 28-39; note col.10, lines 66-67, col. 11, lines 1-5).

Regarding claim 45, Lager further teaches a system wherein the mobile data transmission module is a Transceiver (TRX) module (Fig. 8, transceiver (not shown) connected to the antenna of PLMN-SW, for communication with the GPRS-MS).

Regarding claim 46, Lager further teaches a system wherein the signaling module is Radio Resource Management (module (not shown) located within SGSN of Fig. 8, col. 8, lines 6-30).

Regarding claim 47, Lager further teaches a system wherein the signaling module is GPRS Mobility Management (SCM of Fig. 8, col. 14, lines 64-67, col. 15, lines 1-10; wherein the SCM provides security by permitting or denying access to the packet data network).

Regarding claim 48, Lager further teaches a system wherein the signaling module is Session Management (NIP-RC of Fig. 8, col. 12, lines 49-54).

Regarding claim 50, Lager further teaches a local information system interface (Fig. 8, IP-TUN line).

Regarding claim 51, Lager further teaches an appliance control interface (Fig. 8, P1 line).

Regarding claim 52, Lager further teaches a system wherein the interface is an intranet gateway (an intranet gateway interface is inherent in the system depicted in Fig. 8, since an interface is required for the exchange of data between the access node of PLMN-SW and the intranet of PDN2).

Regarding claim 54, Lager teaches a local information system interconnected with the WAIN (Fig. 8, ISP2).

Regarding claim 57, Lager teaches a local appliance control system interconnected with the WAIN (Fig. 8, PDN2)

Regarding claim 58, Lager teaches a wireless data collector interconnected with the WAIN (Fig. 8, **GPRS-MS**; col. 15, lines 10-15).

Regarding claim 59, Lager teaches a system wherein the radio interface is a GPRS radio interface (GPRS-MS transmits over radio interface represented by "Sending NIP" signal in Fig. 8).

Regarding claim 60, Lager teaches a system wherein the network interface is an IP interface (Fig. 8, **IP-TUN** line connected to **ISP2**).

Regarding claim 61, Lager teaches mobile transmission modules modulating data packets (it is well known in the art that data packets are modulated for transmission over a communication network).

Regarding claim 62, Lager teaches mobile transmission modules compressing data packets (col. 3, lines 64-67, col. 4, lines 1-2).

Regarding claim 63, Lager teaches mobile transmission modules encrypting data packets (col. 3, lines 41-45).

Regarding claim 64, Lager teaches mobile transmission modules multiplexing data packets (multiplexing data packets are known in the art for transmitting signals over a single channel; TDMA is supported by GPRS, thus multiplexing is inherent).

Regarding claim 65, Lager teaches mobile transmission modules correcting errors in data packets (error correction in data packets are well known in the art for proper data reception).

Regarding claim 66, Lager teaches mobile transmission modules segmenting data packets (it is known in the art that data packets are segmented - encapsulated and decapsulated for transmission among different network protocols; col. 5, lines 32-39).

Regarding claim 67, Lager teaches mobile transmission modules controlling the sequence of data packets (controlling the sequence of data packets is well known in the art, and occurs within the access control unit, **AC**, in Fig. 8).

Regarding claim 68, Lager teaches the device as a network node where no specified parameters are present (col. 11, lines 6-16).

10. Claims 49 and 53 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lager, Pines and Benveniste, as applied to claim 39, and further in view of Gaffney (US 6,333,919).

Regarding claim 49, Lager teaches a system with interfaces.

Lager fails to explicitly teach a voice interface.

However, Gaffney teaches a system with voice interfaces (Fig. 1, **interface 110 and 120**).

In view of this, having the system of Lager and then given the teachings of Gaffney, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, to modify the system of Lager, Pines and Benveniste, by including a voice interface, in order to provide a link for the exchange of voice data between devices.

Regarding claim 53, Lager teaches a system having ports.

Lager fails to explicitly teach an RJ11 port for a fixed wired telephone connection.

However, Gaffney teaches a fixed wire telephone connection (Fig. 1, desk phone 450; col. 4, lines 55-56) and it is known in the art that desk phones commonly use an RJ11 jack.

In view of this, having the system of Lager, Pines and Benveniste and then given the teachings of Gaffney, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, to modify the system of Lager, by including an RJ11 port, in order to provide a connection for telephone use.

11. Claims 55 – 56 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lager, Pines and Benveniste as applied to claim 39 above, and further in view of Swartz (US 2003/0053444).

Regarding claim 55, Lager teaches a WAIN and commands from the mobile station to the local information system.

Lager fails to teach voice recognition subsystem

However, Swartz teaches voice recognition subsystem (page 7, paragraph 72).

In view of this, having the system of Lager and then given the teachings of Swartz, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, to modify the system of Lager, by including voice recognition subsystem, in order to allow the user to verbally request information from the local information system.

Regarding claim 56, Lager teaches a WAIN relaying information from the local information system to the mobile station.

Lager fails to teach text-to-speech synthesis subsystem.

However, Swartz teaches text-to-speech subsystem (page 7, paragraph 74).

In view of this, having the system of Lager and then given the teachings of Swartz, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, to modify the system of Lager, by including text-to-speech subsystem, in order to allow the user to receive audio data which was originally in text form.

Response to Arguments

12. Applicant's arguments filed 3/10/06 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicant argues Lager, Pines and Benveniste fail to teach an intermediately wired and/or wireless dedicated broadband connection between the plurality of mobile stations and the at least one packet data network, wherein the dedicated broadband connection is to implement a simplified protocol structure. However, examiner respectfully disagrees and would like to direct the applicant's attention to the above rejection of claims 1 and 39 and Figure 8 in the Lager patent. The intermediately wired and/or wireless dedicated broadband connection between the plurality of mobile stations and the at least one packet data network, is illustrated between GPRS-MS (mobile), PLMN-SW (WAIN) and PDN (packet data network). Furthermore, a simplified protocol structure is implemented for communication between GPRS-MS, PLMN-SW and PDN. Since one protocol exists between GPRS-MS and

PLMN-SW, and another protocol between PLMN-SW and PDN, a simplified protocol is performed between the devices. Additionally, a simplified protocol structure has not been defined within the claims and examiner has interpreted the meaning to be as stated above.

Conclusion

13. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Rhonda Murphy whose telephone number is (571) 272-3185. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday 8:00 - 4:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Chau Nguyen can be reached on (571) 272-3126. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Rhonda Murphy
Examiner
Art Unit 2616

RM



CHAU NGUYEN
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600